

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-18, 20 and 21 were pending. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18 and 20-21 have been amended. Claims 4, 13 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 22-25 are newly submitted. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in FIG. 2 and the associated text. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18, and 20-25 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. The § 102/103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 13 and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,084,598 ("Chekerylla").

Claims 5-6 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chekerylla in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,833,050 ("Takagi").

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chekerylla in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,434 ("Curtis").

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer system including a resolution changing unit operable to zoom in on an image displayed on a display screen of a display apparatus in accordance with a pre-determined magnification amount by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution.

A potential advantage of such a computer system is that a user can zoom in on an image (displayed on a display screen) without using software to perform the zoom, and by using only a hardware unit – e.g., a resolution changing unit (see specification page 3, line 18 – page 4, line 5).

*A. Chekerylla Fails to Disclose Zooming In On an Image Displayed on a Display Screen
in Accordance With a Pre-determined Magnification Amount By Changing a
Resolution of a Display Apparatus From a First Resolution to a Second Resolution*

As described in the background section of Applicant's specification, "Windows 98 and Windows NT, which are operating systems from Microsoft Inc., include a tool called "magnifier" as standard. This tool opens a special window used for displaying an enlarged image, and enlarges and displays a portion in the vicinity of the mouse cursor or key cursor in this special window in real time" (specification page 2, lines 13-16). The specification further describes that such technologies "use software to zoom the image [and therefore] CPU overhead is introduced" (specification page 3, lines 18-19).

Chekerylla describes such a conventional technology that uses software to perform zoom operations. In particular, Chekerylla provides a computer program that includes instructions that provide ZOOM-IN and ZOOM-OUT controls that change the display resolution of an image. The ZOOM-IN control increases the size of the image by a fixed percentage, and the ZOOM-OUT control decreases the size of the image (col. 10, ll. 21-33). Other than the unique methods for allowing a user to perform different graphic modification operations that depend upon a cursor location, the basic concepts of Chekerylla were addressed as prior art in the Applicant's specification.

Specifically, while Chekerylla discloses changing a display resolution of an image when performing a zoom-in or zoom-out operation, Chekerylla fails to disclose zooming in on an image by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution (emphasis added). Instead, Chekerylla (as with other conventional technologies) requires use of a computer program to change a display resolution of an image in order to perform a zoom operation on the image.

In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner cites col. 10, lines 21-45 of Chekerylla as disclosing a display zoom factor changing unit for changing a display zoom factor by changing the display resolution of a display apparatus. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, in this cited portion Chekerylla discloses a ZOOM-IN control and a ZOOM-OUT control that respectively increases and decreases the size of an image by changing a display resolution of the image. The manner in which the display resolution of the Chekerylla's image is changed is through a computer program. In contrast, claim 4 (now cancelled, the features of which are substantially incorporated in to claim 1) requires changing a display zoom factor by changing the display resolution of a display apparatus (emphasis added). Chekerylla does not teach or suggest changing a display resolution of a display apparatus in order to perform the ZOOM-IN or ZOOM-OUT controls.

B. Takagi and Curtis Fail to Disclose Zooming In On an Image Displayed on a Display Screen in Accordance With a Pre-determined Magnification Amount By Changing a Resolution of a Display Apparatus From a First Resolution to a Second Resolution

Takagi discloses a keyswitch device in which the upward and downward movement of a key top is guide-supported through a guide support member (see Abstract).

Curtis discloses a method for using all zero intensity, half intensity, and full intensity colors that are available from a display when rendering color images (see Abstract).

The Examiner does not cite Takagi or Curtis as disclosing zooming in on an image by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution. Nevertheless, Takagi and Curtis fail to disclose zooming in on an image by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution, as recited in claim 1.

C. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Neither Chekerylla, Takagi, nor Curtis discloses zooming in on an image by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution. Consequently, any combination of Chekerylla, Takagi, and Curtis cannot render claim 1 obvious.

D. Other Independent Claims

Claims 9, 17 and 20-21 each incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claims 9, 17 and 20-21 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over Chekerylla, Takagi, and Curtis (either alone or in combination) for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18, and 20-25 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 493-4540

September 2, 2005